

University of Mississippi Medical Center, where her husband was a founding father.

The Guytons' van collided with a car driven by Marjorie Guthrie, of Yazoo City, shortly before 4 p.m. on U.S. 49 North in Hinds County, said Warren Strain, a spokesman for the state Department of Public Safety. Guthrie's condition was unavailable.

Guyton, 83 of Jackson, leaves behind 10 children—all doctors—and a legacy of research.

The modest physician's hallmark discovery was proving that blood flow is regulated by the body's billions of capillaries and not by the heart, as long thought.

"It's just a loss of a giant of the 20th century," said Dr. Wallace Conerly, UMC's chief executive officer. "Still today, what most of us know about hypertension and congestive heart failure, that man did it."

An Oxford native, he worked most of his life as a teacher and researcher at UMC, where he was chair of the department of physiology and biophysics for 41 years. He authored the *Textbook of Medical Physiology*.

"I used his textbook to get through Tulane Medical School in 1956," Conerly said.

Guyton retired in 1989 at age 69 from UMC with a gala dubbed Arthur Guyton Day by the state and city.

"He still came to the office almost every day," said Barbara Austin, a UMC spokeswoman. "He still taught classes."

Guyton, partially paralyzed from polio at age 27, designed a motorized wheelchair, special hoist and walking brace for which he later earned a Presidential Citation.

"My father came from a farm and gave us our goals," Guyton told *The Clarion-Ledger* in 1989. "My mother had been a teacher and a missionary in China where she taught physics and math, so we could always ask her the scientific questions."

Heralded with more than 50 national and international awards in medicine, Guyton always was quick to skip over his own accomplishments to compliment his wife and children. He married Ruth Weigel in 1943 after the two met during a bicycle ride.

The cause of the accident is under investigation, Strain said.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Under the previous order, the time until 5 p.m. shall be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my understanding is the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, is about to make a presentation to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to be recognized following Senator BYRD's presentation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the very distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

#### EULOGY FOR MRS. MARY JANE OGILVIE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 1, Mary Jane Ogilvie, the be-

loved wife of the Rev. Dr. John Lloyd Ogilvie, passed away. A light has gone out in the lives of the many people who were touched by her love, her dedication, and her compassion.

Rev. Dr. John Lloyd Ogilvie, who served as the Senate Chaplain from March 3, 1995, until just this past month, was an unfailing source of support on many occasions to many of us in this Chamber, as well as to our families and our staff. He has been a compassionate spiritual advisor and a personal counselor during some of the most dangerous and trying times in the history of the Senate, including the horror of September 11 and the anthrax attack a few weeks later. I think it is fair to say that his unstinting service was heightened by, and a reflection of, the equal strength and understanding of Mrs. Ogilvie in their many years together.

From what I know and understand, Mrs. Ogilvie was a kind, gentle woman, who exhibited indomitable courage and determination. Having dealt with illness in her own life, she was a source of inspiration and comfort in the lives of others. She was a petite woman, but her size belied a remarkable tenacity and will. Mrs. Ogilvie understood suffering, and she reached out to lessen the suffering of others. She was one of those special individuals who made life better and happier for all those who knew her.

Mrs. Ogilvie did not seek the limelight. Her own effervescence and love for her husband and family and friends offered light enough. I am sure that those who grieve for her now will be comforted by the quiet memory of her shining, luminous life.

Dr. Ogilvie will miss her. He will miss her very much. My own wife, Erma, and I extend to Dr. Ogilvie and his children—Scott, Heather, and Andrew—our deepest condolences and most heartfelt sympathies.

Sometimes at eve when the tide is low,  
I shall slip my mooring and sail away,  
With no response to the friendly hail  
Of kindred craft in the busy bay;  
In the silent hush of the twilight pale,  
When the night stoops down to embrace the day

And the voices call o'er the waters flow—  
Sometimes at evening when the tide is low  
I shall slip my moorings and sail away.

Through the purple shadows that darkly trail

O'er the ebbing tide of the Unknown Sea,  
I shall fare me away, with a dip of sail  
And a ripple of waters to tell the tale  
Of a lonely voyager sailing away  
To Mystic Isles where at anchor lay  
The crafts of those who have sailed before  
O'er the Unknown Sea to the Unknown Shore.

A few who have watched me sail away  
Will miss my craft from the busy bay;  
Some friendly barks that were anchored near,  
Some loving hearts that may heart held dear,

In silent sorrow will drop a tear.  
But I shall have peacefully furled my sail  
In moorings sheltered from storm or gale,  
And greeted the friends who have sailed before

O'er the Unknown Sea to the Unseen Shore.

This bit of verse from Lizzie Clark Hardy I recall today in memory of Mrs. Ogilvie, and our dear friend the former Chaplain, Dr. Ogilvie.

Mr. HAGEM. Mr. President, I also rise to express Lilibet's and my sympathy over the loss of a close friend, Mary Jane Ogilvie. As the wife of Dr. Lloyd Ogilvie, our Senate Chaplain, Mary Jane was a friend to many and always offered an attentive ear and an open heart to all of us in the Senate family. Her high spirit and quiet strength endeared her to all who knew her.

Mary Jane was a remarkable woman. Having battled cancer, she counseled others living with cancer. She devoted countless hours to raising awareness and funding for cancer research. She raised a magnificent family . . . which is her legacy. Lilibet and I cherished our friendship with Mary Jane. We will miss her, but we will be renewed and enhanced by the time we had with Mary Jane. Our thoughts and prayers are with Lloyd and the Ogilvie family.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from West Virginia that no one in the Senate is better able to express the interests not only of the Senator from West Virginia but for the Senate as a whole on matters of the type he talked about. Senator BYRD spoke of Reverend Ogilvie and his wife and what they both contributed to life in the Senate. I echo his comments and say that we miss Reverend Ogilvie and his wife, and we grieve for her passing. I thank Senator BYRD for calling the attention of the Senate to it today.

#### DROWNING IN TRADE DEFICITS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, today I will speak about trade. On occasion, I have come to talk about our problems in international trade because it relates to the center of the issues we need to be concerned about with respect to our country's economy; and that is jobs, a growing economy that produces good jobs that pay well, that expands opportunities for the American people. Yet our trade strategy in this country has been a bankrupt trade strategy for a long while.

I will use a chart to describe what I am talking about. The current trade strategy in America is producing nothing but red ink, and not just a small amount of red ink, but we are literally drowning in trade deficits. This is the merchandise trade deficit in this country. These are trade deficits that are completely out of control. Last year, there was \$470 billion in trade deficits.

April 1 was April Fools Day, and that is the day the U.S. Trade Representative released its 2003 report on trade barriers. This is the 2002 report. The 2003 report is not yet available in hard copy, but I am told it is as thick and as voluminous as the 2002 report. It describes the trade barriers that we find overseas and around the world for American goods produced by American workers in American factories. It lists country by country and barrier by barrier foreign markets that are closed to our products.

Frankly, despite all the talk about free trade and expanded trade, there has been very little progress in prying open these markets. Let me use one example that demonstrates better than almost any other of how difficult it has been for us to make real progress on these issues. I will describe it in the context of our trade with Japan in beef—yes, beef. Fifteen years ago now, we reached a trade agreement with Japan so that American beef could be sold into the Japanese marketplace. That trade agreement provided that for every pound of American beef that went into Japan, there would be a 50-percent tariff. That is after our negotiators reached an agreement. We have a very large trade deficit with Japan, but our negotiators reached an agreement that said at the end of this agreement there will now be a 50-percent tariff on every pound of American beef going into Japan, and then it will reduce over time. But if we get increased quantities into Japan, it will snap back.

So 15 years after our beef agreement with Japan, and those who negotiated having had a fiesta of sorts on the front pages of all of our papers talking about this enormous success that we would now get more American beef into Japan, there is now a 38½-percent tariff, and it is about to go back to 50 percent. The USTR report now says that Japan plans to increase the tariff to 50 percent because of an increase in beef imports this year.

The only reason there is an increase in this year is that the Japanese consumers are finally starting to eat beef again after mad cow disease was found in Japan some years ago. So Japan decided that a 38½-percent tariff is not enough. Now it will go back to 50 percent, 15 years after we reached an agreement with this country to take more American beef.

This chart shows the agreements we have with other countries in terms of the balance of trade. My colleagues will see that red represents deficits. We have trade deficits with virtually every major trading partner, with the exception of Australia, and we are about to remedy that because we are about to enter into an agreement with Australia. I assume they will be able to turn a positive trade balance into a deficit very shortly.

It does not matter which agreement we have had, whether it is NAFTA or GATT, what we have done is create cir-

cumstances where all of our major trading partners are running trade surpluses with us.

I will talk a bit about the country of China. We have major trade deficits with China, with Europe, Canada, Mexico, Korea, and Japan. Are they getting better? No, they are getting much worse. Does it hurt this country? Of course it does. It means jobs that would have been in this country to produce goods and services the American people want instead exist in other countries. So the jobs that used to represent American jobs are now belonging to some other country producing those products to ship back into this country.

Let me talk about trade with China in the context of wheat. I come from a State that produces beef and wheat so I am naturally interested in that. I will discuss other products as well. The U.S. trade official in charge of trade with China recently left his job, and he had the courage to say publicly that China has failed miserably to live up to its promises that it made on agricultural trade when it joined the WTO in November of 2001. In fact, our trade official said the United States would be well justified in filing a WTO case against China. He said the evidence of unfair trade by the Chinese is “undeniable,” and the Chinese themselves privately acknowledge they are cheating on agricultural trade.

The official said the administration did not have the spine to take action because the Chinese might be offended. He said the administration was worried that a WTO case would be seen as an in-your-face thing to do to China so soon after China joined the WTO.

When China joined the WTO in November of 2001, the Chinese agreed to significantly expand the amount of imported wheat that would come into China at low tariffs. They agreed for 2002 it would set a tariff rate on imported wheat at 8½ million metric tons. That means 8½ million metric tons of wheat could enter the Chinese marketplace at low tariffs. But according to the Congressional Research Service, Chinese imports were less than 8 percent of what we expected to move into China. China was supposed to allow 8½ million metric tons, but it imported about 662,000 metric tons, and only 169,000 of that was from U.S. producers. How could that be? China's millers increasingly demand high quality wheat—the wheat we produce, wheat we can produce efficiently.

One explanation is, to import wheat under this Chinese TRQ, a Chinese importer needs a license. The license is granted by the Chinese government. The Chinese government decides only 10 percent of the licenses are going to be available to private importers; 90 percent are reserved for the Chinese government itself. If the Chinese government decides not to take American wheat into its marketplace, it will not do it. That is exactly what they have done. They commit to 8.5 million tons

of imported wheat and make sure 90 percent will never be brought into the country.

I came to the Senate when this happened and quoted a Chinese agricultural official in the South Asian Post. For the Chinese consumption they were saying a bilateral agreement will open up trade between the United States and China. What he said in the South Asian Post, do not expect that is what we will accept into China. He said that to the Chinese. But they were telling the Americans a different story.

March 17, the USTR official named Bruce Quinn, who was the director of the China desk at USTR, now the former director of the China desk, told wheat industry meetings that USTR should file a case against China at the WTO. What made Mr. QUINN's comments particularly interesting is they were made on the last week in the job for him. He was moving to another agency. He felt then he could speak freely. He said about the Chinese government: The Chinese officials have never disagreed with the United States technical criticism about China administering tariff-free quotas. They just make the political argument you have to understand China, China is a special case. He said the inter agency trade policy review gave the ambassador's office the green light to proceed to take action against the WTO for China, but too many in the administration feel it is an in-your-face thing to do so soon after joining the WTO. Soon after making these comments in the last week on the job, the administration disavowed its comments, saying he was not speaking for the administration, but nobody said Mr. QUINN had said something wrong or what he said was wrong.

Why should we be reluctant to file a case against China at the WTO if evidence of cheating is rampant, so rampant that even the Chinese government admits it? Isn't that what the WTO was supposed to provide, a forum for dealing with unfair and illegal trade practices? If we let the Chinese government or China off the hook in the first year or two of this bilateral agreement, what will happen in the future?

Some might say this is about wheat and they are not wheatgrowers. For those who might view the proceedings and think we do not grow wheat and do not see it as a big deal selling grain or wheat to China, this is just one example of many that represents this monumental trade deficit. Our trade deficit in goods this past year was \$470 billion. One-fourth of that, \$103 billion, was with China alone. The deficits of Canada, \$50 billion. Mexico, \$37 billion. And Japan and Europe. Not only do we have deficits with trading partners, but we have deficits in almost every sector of trading: \$110 billion deficit in vehicles, \$47 billion trade deficit in consumer electronics, \$58 billion deficit in clothing.

I mention the trade deficit with China. Just to give an example of what causes much of this, in many cases it is

incompetent trade negotiators on our part. We negotiate a bilateral with China and our trade negotiators agree, after a phase-in with respect to the U.S. and China, we will agree to a 10 times higher tariff on U.S. automobiles that we attempt to sell in China than would be imposed on Chinese automobiles in the United States. We say we will impose 2.5 percent on Chinese automobiles that are shipped here and you impose a 25 percent tariff on U.S. automobiles in China. I don't know who would agree to that. Whoever it is does not deserve to be paid by the American taxpayers. It is an incompetent position to engage in bilateral negotiations and tie our consumers', our employees' hands behind their back in international trade. We will do that by saying you can go ahead and impose tariffs 10 times the amount of tariffs we would impose on equivalent goods.

The trade deficit with Canada, similarly, is a deficit that in some respects comes from the Canadians as a result of the trade agreement being allowed to continue, a Canadian wheat board, which would be illegal in this country, a state trading enterprise would be illegal in this country. In Canada, it sells into this marketplace at secret prices, undercuts our farmers, and essentially thumbs its nose at American officials when they say we want the evidence of selling below acquisition costs in our marketplace and, therefore, dumping illegally in our marketplace. And the Canadians say, We are sorry; we do not intend to disclose anything to you, or any prices in this country.

Trade deficit with Europe, \$82 billion last year. The WTO was supposed to provide us with a forum to resolve trade disputes. The fact is, it has not with respect to Europe. We went to the WTO, got a dispute resolution in our favor against Europe dealing with the import of U.S. beef to Europe which Europe was preventing. And despite that, we are still not getting U.S. beef into the European marketplace.

Trade deficit with Korea, \$13 billion in 2002. I spoke before about cars from Korea, but let me give an example. We have just received the 2002 figures for automobile trade with Korea. The Koreans sold 633,000 Korean cars in this country. We sold 3,200 in Korea; 633,000 this year and 3,200 that way.

Now, why we do not sell more vehicles? Take the Dodge Dakota pickup truck. In February of this year, DaimlerChrysler started to sell that pickup truck in Korea. The Dodge Dakota truck is made in Detroit, Michigan. Korea does not manufacture pickups like Dodge Dakotas, so DaimlerChrysler thought it had a good potential market in Korea and started to market the vehicle to small business owners. It was very successful. It got orders for 60 pickup trucks in February, another 60 in March. That does not sound like much, especially when Korea is sending us 633,000 vehicles in a year, but it is a start. At an annualized rate that would amount to a 50-percent

increase in car imports from the U.S. into Korea, into the marketplace just from the Dodge Dakota pickup alone.

Guess what happened? In March, last month, an official with the Ministry of Construction and Transportation decided the Dakota pickup posed a hazard in the marketplace so he announced the cargo covers on pickups, on Dodge Dakotas, were illegal and the drivers of those pickups would be fined if they put a cargo cover on the pickup truck. The newspapers had giant headlines: Government ministry finds Dodge Dakota covers illegal. Guess what happened? The Korean people got the message. Korean car purchasers canceled 55 of the 60 orders scheduled for March and now you cannot find a buyer for a Dodge Dakota in Korea, where in the last couple of months hundreds were lining up. Once again, we discover that trade is not free and it is not fair.

I have a chart that shows just one example of one sector, and these are last year's numbers, but, as I indicated, they are the same as this year, essentially. They ship us all their cars and this represents good jobs. We cannot get American cars into Korea. Just ask yourself: If the American consumers want to buy Hyundais and Daewoos and cars that are produced in Korea to come into this country, should they have the right? Absolutely. But what if a Korean wants to buy a Mustang? What if a Korean wants to buy a Ford Mustang convertible? Should they have that opportunity, that right? Do they now? Of course not. The Koreans are making sure we are not getting American cars into Korea. The result is an increased trade deficit, fewer good jobs in this country, and the further result is nobody seems to care. All they want to do is negotiate another incompetent agreement.

One of my feelings about the USTR is they come to this Congress asking for fast-track authority, which I think is nuts, saying to Congress: Tie your hands behind your back; let us negotiate an agreement in secret, and when we bring it to you, you decide by rule you cannot amend it.

I think that is plain nuts. Nonetheless, they were able to persuade enough people in the Senate and the House.

So they have fast-track authority so the next agreement they make with another country, they will bring it to the Congress, take it or leave it, no amendments in order. If they hadn't had fast track when they did the United States-Canada agreement, we wouldn't be stuck with the problem we have with the Canadian Wheat Board dumping into our marketplace, cutting into our farmers. But you couldn't offer an amendment. Who knows what will be in the next agreement they make? But when they make the agreement with another country, it will come here, likely pass the Senate and House, and the newspapers that support all this will trumpet this as an expansion of trade and it is free trade and it is wonderful and everybody—all boats are lifted by it.

That is total nonsense. I am in favor of expanded trade and expanded opportunity, but I am in favor of trade officials in this country having a spine and backbone to stand up for the interests of this country.

Should we continue to decide it is our lot in life to compete with somebody who is making 30 cents an hour, working 70 hours a week? Should we compete with a 12-year-old working 12 hours a day making 12 cents an hour? That happens, by the way. Is that fair competition?

That product is produced in any number of countries overseas and then shipped to the marketplace in Toledo or Fargo or Manchester or New York City. Is that fair trade? Is that what our producers ought to compete against? Or should we have some basic standards which say that what we fought for for over a century in this country—the right to work in a safe workplace, the right to organize, the right to be paid a fair wage, the right not to expect you have to work next to children; all of those rights that were fought for in this country—some people died for them; some people chained themselves to the factory gates for those rights—should all those be rights over which producers pole-vault to rush to another country to produce and say we don't have to worry about that, we don't have to worry about dumping pollution into the stream or the air, hiring 12-year-old kids, putting them in an unsafe workplace, we can do that because we have the right to do that and we have the right to ship our products to our country?

They ought not have that right because that is not fair trade. It is not fair competition, and we should not ask American workers and producers to compete against that.

There are so many issues to talk about with respect to international trade. In the end, I come back to the notion that it represents the strength of our economy to maintain a strong manufacturing base. No country will long remain a strong economic power if it does not retain a basic manufacturing base. Our manufacturing base is very quickly moving from this country to countries where production costs are lower. It is one thing to say we lose in international competition. It is quite another to say we are going to set up the competition in a manner that is fundamentally unfair and guarantees you lose.

In my judgment, whether it is farmers or manufacturing workers or textile plants, if we can't compete and win against fair competition, then our plants should not make it at all. But the competition ought to be required to be fair.

None of these trade agreements require that—none of them. Whether it is someone who is ranching out there today, producing cattle for a market and expecting to be able to move it into Japan without a 50-percent tariff or somebody who is raising potatoes in

the Red River Valley expecting to be able to move potato flakes into Korea without a 300-percent tariff or somebody producing Durham wheat, expecting not to compete against the state cartel in Canada that undersells them at secret prices, or, yes, a big automobile company in this country that expects not to have to compete against those who produce elsewhere and keep their markets closed to us—all of those are very serious problems relating to this country's economy and this country's ability to produce good jobs that pay well for the American people.

A \$470 billion trade deficit this year—somebody is going to have to pay that bill. You can make the case—at least economists do—that the budget deficit is money we owe to ourselves. You cannot make that case with the trade deficit. This is money we owe to other countries that will inevitably be repaid with a lower standard of living in this country. That is why it is important at some point that we pay attention to it and view this as a crisis.

You can't get the editorial pages of the major newspapers to say so. You can't even get an op-ed piece published in the Washington Post unless you have a vision about trade that exactly matches theirs and the prevailing view in this town, which is: There are free traders—that is what they say—there are free traders who see beyond the horizon, who have a world view that is learned and is to be commended.

Then there are the others and the others are xenophobic isolationist stooges who just have never gotten it and understood that things have changed in the world.

Those are the two sides. If you are someone who says an unkind word at all about this structure of trade agreements that requires us to compete unfairly and allows others to compete unfairly against us, you don't have a chance of having that view expressed in the major newspapers in this country. That is regrettable because that means we don't have an aggressive debate on international trade.

The debate should never be about: Is expanding trade something that helps our country and helps others around the world? The debate ought to be about as we globalize—and we are globalizing our economies very quickly—will the rules of international trade in this global economy keep up with the galloping globalization? The answer to that, until now, regrettably, has been no. The rules have not kept pace, and that is why we find ourselves in this position.

I yield the floor.

I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

### NOMINATION OF CORMAC J. CARNEY, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will go into executive session to consider the nomination of Cormac J. Carney, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Cormac J. Carney, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am pleased today to speak in support of Judge Cormac Carney, who has been nominated to the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

Following his graduation from Harvard Law School in 1987, Judge Carney entered private practice with the high powered law firm of Latham & Watkins. He worked there until 1991. He next worked as an associate for another widely respected law firm, O'Melveny & Myers, where he became a partner in 1995. He remained at O'Melveny until his appointment to the Orange County Superior Court in 2001, where he has presided over both criminal and civil matters.

Prior to his appointment to the bench, Judge Carney was an exceptional business litigator who typically represented Fortune 500 companies as both plaintiffs and defendants. His areas of expertise included complex matters such as real estate, partnership, lender liability, environmental law, intellectual property, and insurance coverage.

Even with a heavy workload and prestigious clients, Judge Carney devoted numerous hours to pro bono work for the disadvantaged. As a partner at O'Melveny, he supervised the firm's junior lawyers on pro bono cases, which included housing issues, education, civil rights, and the rights of homeless people. Because of the firm's extensive pro bono work, the Orange County Bar Association awarded it the Pro Bono Services Award, and the Orange County Public Law Center awarded it the Law Firm of the Year Award.

Since his appointment to the bench, Judge Carney has become involved with victims' rights. He currently serves as a member of the Governing Board of Victim Assistance Programs in Orange County. The Board provides support and guidance to all victim assistance programs and advises on procedure and policies relating to operations of victim centers located throughout Orange County.

Although Judge Carney has had a stellar legal career, I must note that before he made law his chosen profession he played professional football, first for the New York Giants and then for the Memphis Showboats. The legal profession is fortunate that he ultimately joined our ranks, since he has served on both sides of the bench with compassion, integrity, intelligence and fairness. I am confident that he will serve with the same qualities on the Federal district court bench.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to support the nomination of Judge Cormac Carney for the Central District of California.

Judge Carney is a bright, young judge with truly impressive credentials. Judge Carney graduated cum laude from UCLA, where he earned All-American honors as a wide receiver. He attended Harvard Law School, worked as a partner for the prestigious law firm of O'Melveny & Myers, and has served with distinction as a Los Angeles Superior Court judge.

I am confident he will prove a valuable addition to the bench in the Southern District of California.

Today's vote on Judge Carney marks a milestone event for California's bipartisan Judicial Advisory Committee, which Senator BARBARA BOXER and I set up with the White House.

Judge Carney is the eighth judge to come out of the advisory committee. Nearly every one of these judges has passed out of the committee by a unanimous vote.

With Judge Carney's confirmation, the committee will have filled all the current district court vacancies in California.

This is the first time in recent memory that all of California's authorized district court judgeships are filled.

I would like to give credit to Jerry Parsky and the White House for working constructively with the California Senate delegation in a bipartisan manner to get these judgeships filled.

The results of the committee's efforts speak for themselves. On average, these eight California judges have received Senate confirmation within 114 days of their nomination.

In contrast, during the last year of the Clinton administration, district court nominees took an average of 196 days to get confirmed.

We have confirmed these nominees efficiently and without rancor. This process has enabled the best and the brightest legal minds of our state to gain admission to the Federal bench.

I hope the Senate sees our efforts in California as a model of how the judicial nominations process could work.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Cormac J. Carney, of California, to be